REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 3-5, 8, 10-12 and 14 are amended herein. No claims have been allowed.

Claims 1, 3, 8, 10 and 14 are amended to correspond with applicant's disclosed invention (see, e.g., Fig. 1 and related portions of applicant's specification, as well as applicant's abstract) and also (with respect to claims 1 and 8) to provide proper antecedent basis for corresponding dependent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Gibson (U.S. Patent No. 6,274,896).

Gibson (abstract, cover figure and title) teaches a field effect transistor device with a folded (i.e., serpentine) gate electrode 16a/16b. The Examiner in particular refers to Gibson at Fig. 2 as teaching a field effect transistor device having a surface of a channel region below gate electrode 16 as being corrugated.

As noted above, applicant has amended claim 1 and claim 8 to conform with applicant's disclosed invention, (see, e.g., Fig. 1 and related portions of applicant's specification, as well as applicant's abstract) and also to provide proper antecedent basis for corresponding dependent claims.

Applicant's response in the main is that each and every element within applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed within applicant's independent claims 1 and 8 is not taught within Gibson.

The key element of applicant's claimed invention is that at least one of: (1) an interface of a channel region covered by a gate electrode; and (2) a surface of the gate electrode, is corrugated. The corrugation is clearly shown in applicant's Fig. 1 which is a schematic perspective-view diagram and in applicant's Fig. 8 which is a schematic cross-sectional view diagram. In Fig. 1 in particular, corrugation of an entire active region 10' is shown. This includes source/drain regions 10a and 10b, as well as a channel region defined therebetween and beneath gate electrode 14. The surface of the gate electrode 14 is also clearly corrugated.

While the Examiner asserts that Gibson at Fig. 2 teaches a field effect transistor device with a surface of a channel region beneath gate electrode 16 as corrugated, applicant does not believe that such a feature of Gibson's invention is discernable from Fig. 2. Unlike applicant's schematic perspective-view diagram of Fig. 1 and schematic cross-sectional diagram of Fig. 8, Gibson's Fig. 2 is a plan-view diagram that shows a disposition of a serpentine gate electrode 16 with respect to interdigitated source/drain regions 18 and 20. Gibson's plan-view diagram of Fig. 2 does not show any explicit topography to a surface of gate electrode 16. Nor clearly does Gibson's schematic plan-view diagram show any topography of an interface of a channel region covered by Gibson's gate electrode 16.

A better indication of a corrugation of a top surface of a gate electrode or an interface of a channel region covered by the gate electrode may be discerned from Gibson's Figs. 3a and 3b, which are in turn cross-sectional diagrams that correspond with Gibson's Fig. 1. In Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, gate electrodes are designated as reference numerals 16a and 16b, channel regions are designated as reference numeral 22 (col. 3, line 30 to col. 4, line 5). In Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, gate electrodes 16a and 16b clearly do not have a corrugation of a surface thereof. Rather upper surfaces of gate electrodes 16a and 16b are flat. In addition, an interface of a channel region 22 beneath a gate electrode 16a or 16b also does not have a corrugation. It similarly is also flat.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element set forth in the claim is found, either expressly of inherently described, in a single prior art reference." MPEP 2131 (citing *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California* (citation omitted)).

Gibson apparently does not teach a corrugation of at least one of: (1) a surface of a gate electrode; or (2) an interface of a channel region beneath the gate electrode, as claimed within applicant's claims 1 and 8. Rather Gibson teaches a surface of a gate electrode as flat and an interface of a channel region beneath the gate electrode also as flat. Since the corrugation of a surface of a gate electrode or an interface of a channel region therebeneath is an element of applicant's invention as claimed within claims 1 and 8 and the same is clearly absent within Gibson, applicant asserts that claims 1 and 8 may not properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gibson. Since the remaining claims within the foregoing rejections are dependent upon claim 1 or claim 8 and carry all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 8, applicant additionally asserts that those remaining claims may also not properly be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gibson.

In light of the foregoing response, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1, 2, 6, 8, 9 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Gibson be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3, 7, 10 and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gibson.

The foregoing claims are directed towards numeric limitations pertinent to: (1) periodicity of corrugation within applicant's invention; and (2) thickness of applicant's gate electrode. The Examiner predicates obviousness of these claimed limitations upon applicant's absence of a disclosure that any of the foregoing numeric limitations is critical.

In response, applicant predicates patentability of applicant's claims 3, 7, 10 and 14 upon their dependence upon either claim 1 or claim 8.

In light of the foregoing response, applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejections of claims 3, 7, 10 and 14 be withdrawn.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4, 5, 11 and 12 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The Examiner indicates that allowability of the foregoing claims is predicated upon a claiming of a portion of a gate electrode being corrugated.

In response, applicant has amended claims 4-5 and 11-12 to incorporate therein the limitations of the corresponding base claims and thus provide claims 4-5 and 11-12 as independent claims in accord with the Examiner's foregoing objection and indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant also notes however that the Examiner's indication of allowable subject matter, while pertinent to claims 5 and 11 does not appear to be pertinent to claims 4 and 10. However, applicant still believes that claims 4 and 10 are also allowable since in accord with applicant's above response with respect to Gibson, applicant does not believe that Gibson teaches a corrugation of an interface of a channel region beneath a gate electrode.

Other Considerations

The Examiner has cited no additional prior art of record not employed in rejecting applicant's claims to applicant's invention.

A fee is due for 3 additional independent claims. A Credit Card Payment is attached in the amount of \$258.00.

SUMMARY

J.

Applicant's invention as disclosed and claimed within claims 1, 4-5, 8 and 10-11 is directed towards a field effect transistor device and a method for fabricating the field effect transistor device. The field effect transistor device and the method provide that at least one of:

(1) an interface of a channel region covered by a gate electrode; and (2) a surface of the gate electrode, is corrugated. The foregoing elements of applicant's claimed invention are absent from the art employed in rejecting applicant's claims to applicant's invention.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above remarks, favorable reconsideration of this application, and its early allowance, are respectfully requested.

Any inquiries relating to this or previous communications pertaining to this application may be directed towards the undersigned attorney at 248-540-4040, at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

Randy W. Tung (Reg. No. 31,311)

Tung & Associates 838 West Long Lake Road - Suite 120 Bloomfield Hills, MI 48302 248-540-4040 (voice) 248-540-4035 (facsimile)